Applicants: Aidan J. Lavery et al.

Appl. No.: 10/785,290 Filed: February 23, 2004

page 6 of 8

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 were pending in the subject application. By this amendment, applicants have amended Claim 1 and added new Claim 13. Applicants maintain that the amendments do not raise an issue of new matter. Support for the amendments can be found in the claims and specification as originally filed. In Claim 13, support for the additional specific components (iv) of the protective layer can be found in paragraph [0041] on page 11 of the application. The amendments place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Accordingly, entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 to 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohbayashi et al. (US 6,492,005 B1) in view of Farooq et al. (US 6,703,112 B1).

Applicants respectively traverse this rejection.

The present invention relates to an ink-jet printing material having a support, an image recording layer located on the support, and a protective layer deposited on the image recording layer. Essential for the present application is that improved resistance to the action of ozone and at the same time a high light fastness are achieved with the separate protective layer that includes the specified protecting agents, as documented for example in the comparative Examples on pages 16-24 of the application.

In contrast to the present invention, Ohbayashi et al. teach a recording sheet comprising a support and one or more ink absorptive layers comprising dicyandiamide polycondensation product. The ink-absorbing layer in an ink-jet recording material absorbs the ink liquid and keeps the dye stuff of the ink liquid in the absorptive layer or image recording layer to carry the image.

Applicants: Aidan J. Lavery et al.

Appl. No.: 10/785,290 Filed: February 23, 2004

page 7 of 8

Claim 1 of the present invention now recites that the protective layer is not an image recording layer. In new Claim 13, the protective layer is specified as consisting of specific components that are not the components of an ink absorptive layer. Ohbayashi et al. do not teach a protective layer that is separate from an ink absorptive layer. Farooq et al. is relied on by the Examiner only for teaching organometallic compounds. Thus, the combined teachings of Ohbayashi et al. and Farooq et al. do not teach or suggest Claim 1 or 13 of the present application, i.e. that a separate protective layer is located on the image recording layer, and that the separate protective layer contains (1) an organic sulphur-containing compound which forms complexes with metal ions, (2) a boric acid compound, and (3) an organic compound having the formula MeX or MeX₂ where Me is a transition metal from group VIb, VIIb, VIIIb, Ib and IIb in the Periodic Table and X is an anion of a carboxylic acid having 4 to 12 carbon atoms. The present invention presents a new design for an ink-jet printing material having an improved resistance to the action of ozone and at the same time a high light fastness, in particular having a reduced so-called color shift/ color gamut.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicants: Aidan J. Lavery et al.

Appl. No.: 10/785,290 Filed: February 23, 2004

page 8 of 8

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections set forth in the July 11, 2006 Final Office Action, and earnestly solicit allowance of the claims under examination. If there are any minor matters preventing allowance of the subject application, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney.

A check for \$120.00 is enclosed for the fee for a one month extension of time. No other fee is deemed necessary in connection with the submission of this Amendment. However, if any other fee is required to maintain the pendency of the subject application, authorization is hereby given to withdraw the amount of any such fee from Deposit Account No. 01-1785. Any overpayments may be credited to Deposit Account No. 01-1785.

Respectfully submitted,

AMSTER, ROTHSTEIN & EBENSTEIN LLP Attorneys for Applicants

90 Park Avenue

New York, New York 10016

(212)(33(6-8000

By

Dated: November 10, 2006

New York, New York

Alan D. Miller, Reg. No. 42,889